

Subject: More Thoughts on Snyder and the CIA

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Date: Wednesday, 7 September 2016, 16:58

Malcolm,

Thank you for your analysis of Snyder's legal beagle denial of any contacts, approaches, or liaisons with any agency, "including the CIA." I agree with your view that Snyder might have been the first case of the use of integrated "legitimate cover," by joining the Foreign Service before this arrangement was formalized during or shortly after 1962. And I also agree that the truly hard evidence would most likely have been restricted to the OS Covert Security Division.

This is extremely valuable to me as it helps me to anticipate, should I push firmly on a Snyder-CIA connection, the possible pushback from dogmatists or Agency apologists.

After giving this matter considerable thought for more than a week now, I am convinced that the Agency's use of Snyder cannot be accurately characterized as "off the books." The scraps of paper that we have been allowed to see do demonstrate a witting, discrete, and direct use of Snyder by the Agency:

- "At Agency request, Subject provided some information on and a personal assessment of Brzezinski." [J. M. Evans, CI/SIG, to Chief, CI/Support, 10/5/70]

"NB: They've got a matter of cover and a DCI Statement re Snyder to keep in mind." [DC/CI comment, RR Sheet, 10/5/70]

"CONTACT REPORT: "I suggested to Subject that he could help us out a great deal ... keeping in touch with us on matters that come to his attention which he knew would be useful to us ... Subject was completely agreeable, volunteered to help us in any way he might be useful ... My interest in him, from an operational point of view, has been a long standing feeling that Subject might well be the type to cooperate with the Agency without revealing such a fact to the Department ... He is completely in accord with the Agency's objectives and methods ... the totally matter-of-fact manner in which he accepted my suggestion re spotting and screening for us at Harvard does, I think, support my view." [Underline is in original document] [Brickham Contact Report, 9/18/56]

- CONTACT REPORT: I enlarged on the importance to us of having in Moscow a trained and competent officer merely to case and assess dead drop sites—not to do anything compromising—rather than having to recruit, train and send in, at the cost of ten thousand dollars, a one-shot traveler to do just this one thing. I also mentioned bitterly the desirability of having personal letters, using the letter pouch, sent to a CIA controlled address, merely so that the technical people can give us definite opinions as to whether the Soviets are getting into this channel ... Subject listened to all of the above with considerable interest ... He provided names of three persons at Harvard whom he thought highly suitd to our interests ... he agreed to keep his eyes open for other possible candidates and to send us names and descriptions to our accommodation address. [Brickham Contact Report, 12/14/56]

It is important to emphasize that Brickham is authoring contact reports on Snyder, who swore under oath that he had no contacts with the CIA. Perhaps we can infer from the RIF blocs these contact

reports are in something about where they were routed and filed. Meanwhile, of course Snyder knew that "us" meant the CIA, and that Brickham had contacted him to ask if he would, among other things, case and assess dead drop sites in Moscow—not as a personal favor for Brickham, who would not be there—but for the Agency contingent in Moscow and the SRD in Langley.

The characterization of Snyder's activities by Evans in CI/SIG as having been undertaken *at the Agency's request* is, I think, sufficient to suggest that Snyder's 6/1/78 denial—irrespective of preparation by the legal beagles and how much he may have deviated from a prearranged script—could be considered perjury.

Best
John